

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Subgroup
March 28-29, 2000
HISTORY RECORD

FAA Control # 00-01-223

SUBJECT: Designation of NoPT and Related AIM Material.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: Handbook 8260.19C provides the following guidance to procedures specialists for charting of the regulatory "NoPT" requirement [Paragraph 810 a.(2)]:

"NoPT shall be entered in the "TO" column for initial segments that permit elimination of the procedure turn. The intermediate segment shall only be designated NoPT if necessary to clarify the procedure. A segment after a course reversal fix shall not be designated NoPT."

This directive language can result in the charting of confusing procedures, especially where a fix on the intermediate segment within the procedure turn area, but prior to the procedure turn fix, is annotated "NoPT" after the fix. This situation is exacerbated by a difference in philosophy between Jeppesen and NOS concerning the source document and its use. While ALPA agrees with Jeppesen's objectives in this case, we are concerned with the manner in which they arrived at that objective.

Recently, ALPA discovered an unusual designation of "NoPT" on fixes within the procedure turn area on all the ILS SIAPs for Atlanta, Hartsfield (KATL) Airport. While NOS charted these "NoPT" designations, they did not appear on Jeppesen charts. Inconsistent charting by these two major charting agencies results in confusion within the aviation community. The KATL SIAPs have been corrected by P-NOTAM, except for two ILS SIAPs that have further criteria non-compliance issues because of two step-down fixes within the procedure turn area.

Finally, related to the charting of "NoPT" is the lack of understanding within the aviation community about the requirement to execute a course reversal except when NoPT is charted on a segment being flown, vectors are provided to final, or timed approaches are being used. AFS-420 recently received a discrepancy report from a major airline about a terminal route at Jackson Hole, Wyoming intercepting the localizer above the glideslope. The airline's management and pilots wrongly thought "NoPT" was implicit on the feeder route in question.

RECOMMENDATION: The NoPT charting policy should be changed to prohibit charting of NoPT within an intermediate segment or along the final approach course anywhere within a procedure turn area. Further, the FAA should advise both NOS and Jeppesen to resolve ambiguous charting issues through cooperative initiatives with AVN-100 and AFS-420, rather than either taking unilateral action or ignoring charting ambiguities created by the instructions on the source document. "NoPT" is a regulatory designation and, in ALPA's considered opinion, not subject to modification except at the source.

As to the contra-issue of feeder and initial approach segments that require a course reversal, the AIM needs to include concise, clear information about the fact that all terminal routes on SIAPs that have a course reversal, are implicitly "PT required" unless "NoPT" appears on the route. This becomes even more critical with the advent of the new TAA charts.

COMMENTS: This affects FAA Handbook 8260.19, "Flight Procedures and Airspace," the Aeronautical Information Manual, and directive to charting entities.

Submitted by: Captain Simon Lawrence, Chairman
Charting and Instrument Procedures Committee

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

PH: (703) 689-4176

FAX: (703) 689-4370

March 10, 2000

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 00-01): Issue presented by Simon Lawrence on behalf of ALPA. ALPA is recommending that NoPT routes not be established within a course reversal (procedure turn) area. The impetus behind the recommendation was charting disparities between NOS and Jeppesen at Atlanta (Hartsfield) Airport. Compounding the issue was a major carrier flying a feeder route at Jackson Hole WY as a NoPT route when the route was not so designated. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), noted that the AIM language (paragraph 5-4-8a) was 'beefed up' on 2/24/00 at ALPA's request to state firstly that "The procedure turn or hold-in-lieu-of procedure turn is a required maneuver". The exceptions are then specifically addressed. Dave Eckles, AFS-420, agreed to take the issue for study. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 00-02: Dave Eckles presented a status update paper and briefing on the issue noting that AFS-420 has reviewed the issue again. Policy regarding publication of "PT Required" and "NoPT" is clear and no changes are under consideration. Charting specifications are in consonance with Part 91.175. AFS-420 believes that the AIM provides adequate guidance to the pilot and clarification of the provisions of Part 91, as interpreted by FAA General Council. The NoPT charting examples provided by ALPA on two KATL SIAP's were in error and have been corrected. The NoPT issue at KJAC noted by ALPA was clearly pilot error. The two SIAP's at KATL depicting two stepdown fixes in the intermediate segment under the procedure turn (PT) have been brought to the attention of AVN-100 for correction. Charting agencies assume full responsibility for charting variances from the data provided on the FAA 8260-series forms. He recommended the issue be closed. Wally Roberts, ALPA, stated that ALPA desires policy in order 8260.19 to "...not allow NoPT routes to join the approach course within the PT maneuvering area where a stepdown fix exists within that PT maneuvering area." Dave agreed to study the request. **ACTION: AFS-420.**

MEETING 01-01: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper on the issue. It is AFS-420's position that policy regarding publication of "PT Required" and "NoPT" is

clear and no changes are under consideration. Charting specifications are in consonance with Part 91.175 and the AIM provides adequate guidance to the pilot and clarification of the provisions of Part 91, as interpreted by FAA General Council. The specific procedures that prompted ALPA's concern were anomalies and have been corrected. Dave also briefed that the current procedure design policy is adequate and that the change recommended by ALPA on this subject is not deemed necessary. Dave noted that the original and subsequent issues for discussion under this issue number have been addressed and recommend closure. The group concurred. **ACTION: Closed.**
